arXiv:1202.2583v1 [physics.plasm-ph] 12 Feb 2012

Entropy Maximization and Instability of Uniformly Magnetized Plasma

S. Son
18 Caleb Lane, Princeton, NJ 08540

Sung Joon Moon
28 Benjamin Rush Lane, Princeton, NJ 08540

(Dated: February 14, 2012)

The regime where a uniformly magnetized plasma is unstable to the spatial perturbation in the magnetic field is explored. In this regime, the entropy of the plasma system is not maximized in the uniformly magnetized state. The physical implication is discussed in the context of the current generation, the magnetic reconnection, and the dynamo effect.

PACS numbers: 05.20.Gg, 05.70.Fh, 52.25.Kn , 52.25.Xz

It is often assumed that the uniformly magnetized plasmas are dynamically stable, which is not vulnerable to a localized spatial perturbation in the magnetic field. If this is not the case, our premise on the uniform magnetic field that is often taken for granted should be reconsidered carefully.

The second law of the thermodynamics states that the equilibrium state of a Hamiltonian system maximizes the entropy for a given volume and the total energy. The equilibrium configuration of a magnetized one-component electron plasma can be determined by this principle. More specifically, the electron distribution function can be obtained by maximizing the Shannon entropy in the framework of the variational principle, under the constraints of the system-wide conserved quantities such as the gross number of the electrons, the volume, the energy, and the magnetic moment. Consider two kinds of plasma, one is with a uniform magnetic field $\mathbf{B}_1 = B_0\hat{z}$ and the other with a spatially-varying field of $\mathbf{B}_2 = B_0(1+\beta\cos(kx))\hat{z}$, where β is a small number. If the entropy of the latter system is larger than that of the former, it would attest that the plasma with a uniform magnetic field could transition to a spatially varying state. The goal of this paper is to demonstrate that this is indeed the case in certain regime.

Let us name the plasma with the uniform (spatially varying) magnetic field by the plasma $\mathbf{U}$ ($\mathbf{V}$), and denote the corresponding entropy by S_U (S_V). We assume that both plasmas have the same system-wide quantities, including the total energy, the magnetic moment, the total number of the electrons and the volume. The total energy for the plasma $\mathbf{U}$ with a uniform magnetic field $B_0\hat{z}$ is

$$E_U = \int \frac{B_0^2}{8\pi} d^3\mathbf{x} + \sum_i \frac{1}{2} m_e v_i^2, \tag{1}$$

where m_e is the electron mass and the summation of done over all the electrons. The interaction between the electron magnetic moment and the magnetic field is ignored. The total magnetic moment is

$$M_U = \sum_i \frac{m_e c}{B_0} v_i^2, \tag{2}$$

and the Shannon entropy is

$$S_U = -\sum_k p_q \log(p_q), \tag{3}$$

where c is the speed of light, p_q is the probability that the plasma is in the state q, and the summation is done over all the possible states. Using the variation principle and the Lagrange multipliers l_a and l_b, $\delta S + l_a \delta E_U + l_b \delta M_U = 0$, we obtain for each q

$$\delta p_q \left(-\log(p_q) + l_a E_U + l_b M_U\right) = 0, \tag{4}$$

which leads to an anisotropic Maxwellian distribution

$$f_U(\mathbf{v}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}^3} \frac{n_0}{v_{U\perp}^2 v_{U\parallel}} \exp\left(-\frac{v_x^2+v_y^2}{2v_{U\perp}^2} - \frac{v_z^2}{2v_{U\parallel}^2}\right), \tag{5}$$

where $v_{U\perp}$ ($v_{U\parallel}$) is the perpendicular (parallel; z-direction) thermal velocity and n_0 is the electron density. The temperature in each direction can be determined by the energy and the magnetic moment.

Let us now consider the plasma $\mathbf{V}$, with the magnetic field of $B_0(1+\beta\cos(kx))\hat{z}$ where $\beta \ll 1$. Following the same steps, the electron distribution is

$$f_V(\mathbf{v},x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}^3} \frac{n_V}{v_{V\perp}(x)^2 v_{V\parallel}} \exp\left(-\frac{v_x^2+v_y^2}{2v_{V\perp}(x)^2} - \frac{v_z^2}{2v_{V\parallel}^2}\right), \tag{6}$$

where $v_{V\perp}$ ($v_{V\parallel}$) is the perpendicular (parallel) thermal velocity

$$v_{V\perp}(x)^2 = \frac{v_{V\perp}^2}{1+\frac{b\beta\cos(kx)}{1+\beta\cos(kx)}}, \tag{7}$$

where $b = \gamma - 1$ with $\gamma = v_{U\perp}^2/v_{U\parallel}^2$. Three unknowns, $v_{V\perp}$, $v_{V\parallel}$ and n_V, can be determined as a function of

$v_{U\perp}$, $v_{U\|}$, n_0 and β, given the constraints on the total number of electrons, energy and magnetic moment. The invariance in the number of electrons $\int f_V d^3\mathbf{v} = \int f_U d^3\mathbf{v}$ leads to

$$n_V = \frac{n_0}{1 + b(b+1)\bar{\beta}^2}, \tag{8}$$

where $\bar{\beta}^2 = \langle \beta^2 \cos(kx)^2 \rangle = \beta^2/2$, and the constraint on the total magnetic moment

$$\int f_V \frac{v_x^2 + v_y^2}{B_0(1+\beta\cos(kx))} = \int f_U \frac{v_x^2 + v_y^2}{B_0} \tag{9}$$

leads to

$$v_{V\perp}^2 = \frac{1 + b(b+1)\bar{\beta}^2}{1 + (3b^2 + 4b + 1)\bar{\beta}^2} v_{U\perp}^2. \tag{10}$$

Lastly, the constraint on the energy is given as

$$\frac{B_0^2(1+\bar{\beta}^2)}{8\pi} + \int f_V \frac{1}{2} m_e v^2 = \frac{B_0^2}{8\pi} + \int f_V \frac{1}{2} m_e v^2. \tag{11}$$

This leads to the relationship

$$v_{V\|}^2 = v_{U\|}^2 \left[1 + \frac{2v_{U\perp}^2}{v_{U\|}^2}(2b+1)\bar{\beta}^2 - \lambda\bar{\beta}^2 \right], \tag{12}$$

where $\lambda = (B_0^2/8\pi)/(m_e v_{U\|}^2/2)$ is the ratio between the magnetic energy density and the electron parallel kinetic energy density.

Note that, for a Maxwellian plasma, the Shannon entropy is proportional to

$$S \cong -\log(n_e/v_p^2 v_z) = -\log(n_e) + \log(v_p^2) + \log(v_z), \tag{13}$$

where $v_p^2 = v_x^2 + v_y^2$. Defining $\delta\log(n_e) = \log(n_V) - \log(n_0)$, $\delta\log(v_p^2) = \log(v_{V\perp}^2) - \log(v_{U\perp}^2)$ and $\delta\log(v_z) = \log(v_{V\|}^2) - \log(v_{U\|}^2)$, we obtain from Eqs. (8), (10) and (12):

$$\begin{aligned} -\delta\log(n_e) &= b(b+1)\bar{\beta}^2, \\ \delta\log(v_p^2) &= -(2b^2 + 3b + 1)\bar{\beta}^2, \\ \delta\log(v_z) &= -\frac{\lambda}{2(1+\lambda)}\bar{\beta}^2 + \gamma(2b+1)\bar{\beta}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Finally, the entropy difference $\Delta S = S_V - S_U$ is given by $\Delta S = \left(-(b+1)^2 - \lambda/2 + \gamma(2b+1)\right)\bar{\beta}^2$. From the relationship $\gamma = b + 1$, this can be further simplified to

$$\Delta S = \gamma^2 - \gamma - \lambda/2, \tag{15}$$

which is the major result that our argument is based on.

One important constraint that needs to be considered is the self-consistency of the spatially varying magnetic field $B_0\beta\cos(kx)$ and the current generated by the magnetic moment $\mathbf{j}_m = \nabla \times \mathbf{m}$, where $\mathbf{m} = \left(\int f_V (mcv_p^2/B(x)) d^3v\right)\hat{z}$ is the magnetic moment density. In order for the spatially varying magnetic moment to be generated by the current of the spatially varying magnetic field, the relationship $\delta\mathbf{B} = (4\pi/c)\mathbf{m}$, originated from the Maxwell equation $\nabla \times \delta\mathbf{B} = (4\pi/c)\mathbf{j}_m$, needs to be imposed. Equating the relationship to the first order in β, we obtain

$$\gamma \frac{1/2 n_0 m_e v_{U\perp}^2}{B_0^2/8\pi} = 1. \tag{16}$$

The left-hand side of the above equation is exactly γ^2/λ, and Eq. (16) is nothing but $\lambda = \gamma^2$. The condition $\Delta S > 0$ is a sufficient condition for the instability of the plasma $\mathbf{U}$. Using Eqs. (15) and (16), we obtain $\gamma > 2$, which is the same condition with the classical Weibel instability [1, 2]. In order for our analysis to be valid, the wave vector k should be less than the inverse of the typical electron gyro-radius so that $kv_{U\perp}/\omega_{ce} < 1$, where ω_{ce} is the gyro-angular frequency. While the unstable regime identified here is the same as for the Weibel instability, the physical origin is different. In the Weibel instability, the range of the unstable wave vector is $0 < k < \sqrt{\gamma^2/2 - 1}(\omega_{\mathrm{pe}}/c)$; however it is much wider in our theory, $0 < k < r_g^{-1}$, where r_g is the gyro-radius. It would be interesting to examine whether the instability identified here is much more explosive than the Weibel instability.

The discussion on the constraint $\lambda = \gamma^2$ is in order. It is imposed on the condition that the spatially varying part of the magnetic field is originated from the current generated by the electron magnetic moment. While this is a necessary condition for a self-sustaining system, it might be possible to drive the current from outside using various methodologies [3, 4] without perturbing the total energy or the magnetic moment of the plasma so that the condition can be lifted from the constraint. If λ is very close to zero, then the instability can exist for a nearly isotropic Maxwellian plasma since the plasma is unstable even when $\gamma \cong 1$.

It should be noted that as the magnetic moment is not conserved in the presence of the collisions, the result presented here is valid only in the time scale faster than the electron collision rate. In a collisionless system, the magnetic moment *distribution*, as well as the total magnetic moment itself, is conserved. As the plasmas $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ do not have the same *distribution*, the possibility of the dynamic connectivity between $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ should be addressed. One important point to be noted is that due to the spatial variation of the magnetic field, an electron's magnetic moment is ambiguous up to the order of $r_g k$. As a simplified example, consider $\mathbf{B}(x) = B_+\hat{z}$ if $x > 0$ and $\mathbf{B}(x) = B_-\hat{z}$ if $x < 0$. An electron with the gyro-center at $x = 0$ has two different magnetic moments when it is moving at $x > 0$ and $x < 0$. Although the total magnetic moment is conserved (in the statistical sense), the final detailed distribution of the magnetic moment is path-dependent upon how the magnetic field configuration changes from $B_0\hat{z}$ to $B(1+\beta cos(kx))\hat{z}$. Consider the two cases where the magnetic field changes from $B_0\hat{z}$ to $B_0(1+\beta_2 cos(2kx))\hat{z}$ and then finally to $B_0(1+\beta cos(2x))\hat{z}$, and where it changes from $B_0\hat{z}$ directly to $B_0(1+\beta cos(kx))\hat{z}$. The *distributions* of these two cases cannot be the same. In other words, there is an infinite number of degrees of freedom for paths among which we might be able to choose a path that connects the plasma **U** and plasma **V**. While the above argument does not guarantee the dynamic connectivity between the plasma **U** and the plasma **V**, it shows that the chance that there exists a path from the plasma **U** to the plasma **V′**, where the plasma **V′** is very close to the plasma **V**, is high.

With the caution on the dynamical connectivity between the plasmas **U** and **V**, there could be implications of our theory on the dense plasma. As the plasma gets squeezed or expanded as in the inertial confinement fusion process [5], the z-pinch plasma or solar corona magnetic reconnection region [6], the plasma may cross the boundary given in Eq. (16) with $\gamma > 2$. If it does occur, as it crosses the boundary, the plasma would undergo one of the following three transitions before reaching to a stable state. First, the plasma may develop a spatially-varying magnetic field, as considered in this paper. This is possible only with the spatially-varying current generation. Second, the plasma may convert the magnetic field energy into the electron kinetic energy, as in the case of the magnetic reconnection. Finally, the plasma may convert the electron kinetic energy into the magnetic field energy, as in the case of the dynamo effect. Our analysis does not answer which transition should occur.

When the magnetic field is highly intense, as in the case of the astrophysical plasma, the quantum Landau level and other quantum effects become significant [4, 7, 8]. In such a case, the ground state may not be at its minimum (maximum) energy (entropy) level when the magnetic field is uniform. This could leads to the interesting phenomena. Complication would be the quantum diffraction and degeneracy [4, 7–9].

We would like to thank Prof. Fisch on the various helpful discussion on the subject.

[1] E. S. Weibel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **2**, 83 (1959).

[2] P. H. Yoon, and R. C. Davidson, Phys. Rev. A **35**, 2619 (1987).

[3] N. J. Fisch, Rev. Mod. Phys. **59**, 175 (1987).

[4] S. Son, and N. J. Fisch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 225002 (2005).

[5] M. Tabak, J. Hammer, M. Glinsky, W. Kruer, S. Wilks, J. Woodworth, E. Campbell, M. Perry, and R. Mason, Physics of Plasmas **1**, 1626 (1994).

[6] E. N. Parker, Astrophysical Journal **407**, 342 (1993).

[7] S. Son, and N. Fisch, Physics Letters A **329**, 76 (2004).

[8] S. Son, and S. Ku, Physics of Plasmas **17**, 010703 (2010).

[9] S. Son, S. Ku, and S. J. Moon, Phys. Plasmas **17**, 114506 (2010).